

REMARKS**INTRODUCTION:**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 10, 11, 15 and 16 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 5-16 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

A. In the Office Action, at pages 2-8, numbered paragraph 6, claims 1-3, 5, 7-8 and 10-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Qureshi et al. (USPN 6,456,305). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claims 1, 10, 11 15 and 16 have been amended based on page 15, line 17 through page 16, line 15 of the specification.

It is respectfully submitted that Qureshi et al. (USPN 6,456,305) discloses a method and system for automatically forming a graphical display of objects to dimensions of a display window using a default font size or a percent-based font size based on the default font size, as noted in col. 5, lines 18-21 of Qureshi et al.:

The object in the display space may be a text object that is associated with a **percent-based font size**, which is **related to a default font size** included in the master page. (emphasis added)

and in col. 8, lines 47-61:

The first facility also provides for creating a container for at least one Slide page created from a slide. The divisions created by nested DIV tags enable the SlideObj container to **provide** default dimensions and **a default font size for the display space and text objects** in a Slide HTML page that is contained in the SlideObj container. Since DIV tags are used to define the dimensions and font size for a SlideObj container, other DIV tags that are nested in the Slide HTML page may reference the default dimensions of the SlideObj container's display space as a percentage (greater than or less than 100%) to define the dimensions of the display space for each object on the Slide HTML page. Similarly, **a font size for a text object in each Slide HTML page can be referenced as a percentage (greater than or less than 100%) of the default font size** in the SlideObj container. (emphasis added)

However, Qureshi et al. (USPN 6,456,305) does not teach or suggest selection, by a user of a desired font, calculation of a font size and display size based on the selected font, processing original document data based on the calculated font size and calculated display size,

generating the processed document data that reflects the display size calculated and the calculated font size in the desired font type, storing the processed document data, and, switchably viewing the processed document data and at least one portion of the display layout with a user-determined display size, as is substantially recited in the amended independent claims 1, 10, 11, 15 and 16 of the present invention.

In addition, unlike the teaching of Qureshi and Iwamura, in the display system of applicant's invention, display specification data related to the display unit and representing hardware-dependent specifications of the display unit is detected, and the document data is displayed in conformity with the detected display specification data. For example, the display specification data represents a specification of the display unit containing resolution and font size of the display unit (see description on page 9, lines 9-23, of the specification).

In contrast, in the system taught by Qureshi or Iwamura, the display window is a virtual display screen which is basically different from the real screen of the display unit that is utilized in the applicants' claimed display system. Hence, it is difficult for the systems of Qureshi or Iwamura to display the document data in conformity with the detected display specification data as is accomplished in the applicants' invention.

Hence, amended independent claims 1, 10, 11, 15, and 16 are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Qureshi et al. (USPN 6,456,305). Since claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 12, 13, and 14 depend from amended claims 1, 10 and 11, respectively, claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 12, 13, and 14 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Qureshi et al. (USPN 6,456,305) for at least the reasons amended claims 1, 10 and 11 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Qureshi et al. (USPN 6,456,305).

B. In the Office Action, at pages 8-10, numbered paragraph 7, claims 6 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Qureshi et al. (USPN 6,456,305) in view of Iwamura (USPN 6,388,684). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

In Ruiz and Foundation v. A.B. Chance Company, 69 USPQ2d 1690 (CAFC January 29, 2004), the court held:

In making the assessment of differences, **section 103 specifically requires consideration of the claimed invention "as a whole."** Inventions typically are new combinations of existing principles or features. Env'tl. Designs, Ltd. v. Union Oil Co., 713 F.2d 693, 698 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (noting that "virtually all [inventions] are combinations of old elements."). The "as a whole" instruction in title 35 prevents evaluation of the invention part by part. **Without this important requirement, an obviousness assessment might break an invention into its component parts (A + B + C), then find a prior art reference containing A, another containing B, and another containing C, and on that basis alone declare the invention obvious. This form of hindsight reasoning, using the invention as a roadmap to find**

its prior art components, would discount the value of combining various existing features or principles in a new way to achieve a new result – often the very definition of invention. (emphasis added)

Section 103 precludes this hindsight discounting of the value of new combinations by requiring assessment of the invention as a whole. This court has provided further assurance of an “as a whole” assessment of the invention under § 103 by requiring a showing that an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, confronted by the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would select the various elements from the prior art and combine them in the claimed manner. In other words, the examiner or court must show some suggestion or motivation, before the invention itself, to make the new combination. See In re Rouffet, 149 F.3d 1350, 1355-56 (Fed. Cir. 1998). (emphasis added)

As noted above, amended claim 1 has been amended to recite:

1. A display system in which a processed document data from original document data, in conformity with a display specification data stored in a storage device and a layout data contained in the original document data, is displayed on a display unit, comprising:
an interface coupled to receive the original document data;
a central processing unit comprising
 a display specification detection unit detecting a display specification data related to the display unit, the display specification data representing specifications of the display unit;
 a layout data detection unit detecting the layout data of the original document data, identifying text/image data elements through classification of the original document data, reading a maximum display resolution from text data elements, including an optimum font size;
an operation unit utilized by a user to input a desired font type;
wherein the central processing unit reads document font data, calculates a font size of displayed text data in accordance with readability of the displayed text data, calculates a display size based on the calculated font size, **generates the processed document data that reflects the display size calculated and the calculated font size in the desired font type**, stores the processed document data into the storage device, transfers the processed document data from the storage device to the central processing unit, and supplies the processed document data to a display memory in the display unit so that the document data is displayed on the display unit in conformity with the display specification data and the layout data;
the display memory storing the processed document data so that a document is displayed on the display unit in accordance with the processed document data; and a display control unit facilitating switching between controlling a display layout of the display unit based on the detected display specification data and the detected layout data, so that a display size of text data elements in the document data is readable when being displayed on the display unit and controlling the display unit based on user input such that an image of at least one portion of the display layout is displayed on the display unit with a user-determined display size. (emphasis added)

Quershi et al. (USPN 6,456,305) discloses a method and system for automatically forming a graphical display of objects to dimensions of a display window using a default font size or a percent-based font size based on the default font size, but does not teach or suggest amended claim 1 of the present invention (see above). In particular, Quershi et al. does not

disclose the user selecting a desired font, adjusting the display size to provide readability of the desired font when being displayed and to fit the display.

Iwamura et al. (USPN 6,388,684 B1) discloses a method and apparatus for displaying a target region and an enlarged image. However, Iwamura does not disclose amended claim 1 of the present invention (see above).

Even if combined, Quershi et al. (USPN 6,456,305) and Iwamura et al. (USPN 6,388,684 B1) do not disclose or suggest amended claim 1 of the present invention.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 1 of the present invention is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Qureshi et al. (USPN 6,456,305) in view of Iwamura (USPN 6,388,684). Since claims 6 and 9 depend from amended claim 1, claims 6 and 9 of the present invention are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Qureshi et al. (USPN 6,456,305) in view of Iwamura (USPN 6,388,684) for at least the reasons that amended claim 1 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Qureshi et al. (USPN 6,456,305) in view of Iwamura (USPN 6,388,684).

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

May 8, 2006

By:

Darleen J. Stockley
Darleen J. Stockley
Registration No. 34,257

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501